

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 5 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 4 and 7 were previously canceled and by this Amendment claims 6 and 8 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 1 is the only independent claim.

Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and § 102(b) as being anticipated by either Sato et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,280,064) (“Sato”), Kanou (U.S. Patent No. 6,045,245) (“Kanou”), or Natsume et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,224,246) (“Natsume”).

Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Sato, Kanou, or Natsume.

Prior art rejections under § 102 (b) and (e)

Examiner’s rejection of claims 6 and 8 over Sato, Kanou, or Natsume is moot in view of the cancellation of the claims.

Prior art rejections under § 103 (a)

Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected over Sato, Kanou, or Natsume.

Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable because the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must show that there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. In the Office Action, the Examiner has not shown any suggestion or motivation to combine features of the references to render the claims 1-3 and 5 obvious. Thus, claims 1-3 and 5 are patentable.

Alternatively, or in addition, claim 1 is patentable because none of the references teaches, suggests, or provides motivation for all the elements of the claim. Nowhere in Sato is there any mention, *inter alia*, of:

a reflection condition setting step of setting conditions for each of said plurality of reflection regions, including a reflection angle that designates the direction in which light from said light source is reflected by a segment surface that forms said reflective surface

To the contrary, Sato discloses surface elements 16 that are instead diffusion reflective surface elements. The use of diffusive elements teaches away from setting a specific reflection angle that designates the direction in which light from said light source is reflected (col. 4, lines 23-25).

Further, Sato fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a light source disposed such that a longitudinal direction of a shape of a light-emitting region thereof is approximately perpendicular to said optical axis and segmentation axis.

Furthermore, in Kanou, there is no disclosure of the light source being disposed such that a longitudinal direction of a shape of a light-emitting region thereof is approximately perpendicular to the optical axis and segmentation axis.

Finally, as in Sato, Natsume fails to teach a segment surface which forms the reflective surface in the manner claimed. Rather, Natsume also teaches an array of diffusing reflection elements 4s (Figs. 13 and 14).

Thus, claim 1 is not obvious in view of the references and therefore, patentable. In addition, Claims 2, 3, and 5, which depend from claim 1, are patentable for at least the arguments submitted for claim 1.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U. S. Application No. 10/076,581

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven M. Gruskin
Registration No. 36,818

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 15, 2003